

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAWRENCE WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-01-1673 DFL PAN P

vs.

ANA RAMIREZ PALMER, et a.,

Defendants.

ORDER

On August 2, 2006, defendant filed a motion for summary judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56. Plaintiff has not opposed the motion.

A responding party's failure to comply with any order or with the Local Rules "may be grounds for imposition of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court." L. R. 11-110. The court may recommend this action be dismissed with or without prejudice, as appropriate, if plaintiff disobeys an order or the Local Rules. See Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1252 (9th Cir. 1992) (district court did not abuse discretion in dismissing *pro se* plaintiff's complaint for failing to obey an order to re-file an amended complaint to comply with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for *pro se* plaintiff's failure to comply with local rule regarding notice of change of address affirmed).

1 On November 22, 2004, the court advised plaintiff of the requirements for filing
2 an opposition to the motion and that failure to comply with the Local Rules may result in a
3 recommendation of dismissal.

4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, within thirty days of the date of
5 this order, plaintiff shall file either an opposition to the motion for summary judgment or a
6 statement of non-opposition. Failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation
7 that this action be dismissed without prejudice.

8 DATED: September 28, 2006.

9
10 
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

12 14
13 will1673.ftoppmsj
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26